#### RESTORATION AND ARCHITECTURAL BOARD OF REVIEW

## October 23, 2007

Chairman Himes called the meeting of the Tipp City Restoration and Architectural Board of Review to order on Thursday, October 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2007 at 7:30 p.m. Other Board Members in attendance included: Janine Wert, Sadie Gaster, Adam Blake, Joe Bagi, and Rodney Kidwell. Also in attendance were City Planner/Zoning Administrator Matthew Spring and Board Secretary Kimberly Patterson.

Citizens signing the register: Wayne Spitler, Susie Spitler, Jackie Wahl, and Carol Shepherd.

# Minutes

Chairman Himes noted the following changes to the minutes: Page four, change "same" to "gift shop"; item C change "south" to "north"; page five change "go" to "taken". Chairman Himes asked for further discussion. There being none, Mr. Blake moved to approve the September 25, 2007, as amended, seconded by Mr. Kidwell. Motion carried. Ayes: Blake, Kidwell, Himes, and Gaster. Nays: None. Mr. Bagi and Mrs. Wert abstained from the vote.

# Citizens Comments Not on the Agenda

There was none.

Chairman Himes explained the guidelines and procedures for the meeting. He noted that once the Board made a decision the applicant/interested party had 10 days to file an appeal to the Board of Zoning Appeals. After the 10-day waiting period had expired, the applicant may file for the appropriate permits.

# New Business

**A. Susan Spitler – Tippecanoe Historical Society - 20 N. Third Street, Tipp City - Lot: Pt. IL 45** – The applicant requested an approved Certificate of Appropriateness for the removal of an existing chimney and renovation to existing brick work on the western façade of structure.

**Present zoning district:** CC/RA- Community Center/Old Tippecanoe City Restoration and Historic District

**Section(s):** §154.052(L)

Mr. Spring stated that the applicant requested an approved Certificate of Appropriateness for the removal of an existing chimney and renovation to existing brick work on the western façade of structure.

Mr. Spring noted that the unused chimney was located on the southern side of the roof of the structure. Mr. Spring mentioned that the applicant had said that the chimney was leaning slightly and the mortar was falling out. The applicant would like to remove the chimney before it falls onto the roof. The applicant also told Mr. Spring that the chimney had no current use; and for financial and maintenance reasons, they would like to remove it rather than repair it.

RESTORATION AND ARCHITECTURAL BOARD OF REVIEW

## October 23, 2007

The Guidelines Booklet states:

Roofing practices that change the appearance of the structure are strongly discouraged. These include the following:

**Removing elements such as chimneys**, skylights, light wells, dormers and cupolas that provide character to the building.

# Code §154.052(B)(6) states:

**Deteriorated architectural features shall be repaired rather than replaced, whenever practical.** In the event replacement is necessary, the new material should match the material being replaced in composition, design, color, texture, and other visual qualities wherever practical. Repair or replacement of missing architectural features should be based on accurate duplications of features, substantiated by historic, physical, or pictorial evidence rather than on conjectural designs or the availability of different architectural elements from other buildings or structures.

Mr. Spring stated that the applicant also requested a Certificate of Appropriateness for the removal and repair of the upper portion of the brick façade on the western side of the structure. The applicant stated that the bricks were separating from the wall. The applicant also stated that they would not know the full extent of the problem until some of the bricks were removed. The applicant would salvage, clean and reuse as many bricks as possible. Bricks that need replaced would be matched as closely as possible. Mr. Spring stated that the applicant had provided a proposal for the work from Ka-D's Inc. dba K-Masonry for the Boards review.

Mr. Spring provided information regarding bricks, per the Guidelines Booklet, to the Board Members in their staff reports for their review.

Mr. Spring reiterated, Code §154.052(B)(6) states:

**Deteriorated architectural features shall be repaired rather than replaced, whenever practical**. In the event replacement is necessary, the new material should match the material being replaced in composition, design, color, texture, and other visual qualities wherever practical. Repair or replacement of missing architectural features should be based on accurate duplications of features, substantiated by historic, physical, or pictorial evidence rather than on conjectural designs or the availability of different architectural elements from other buildings or structures.

Mr. Spring also stated that if the Restoration Board approved the applicant's request, a Certificate of Appropriateness would be issued in accordance with code.

Mrs. Susie Spitler stated that she was representing the Historical Society in their request. Mrs. Spitler stated that any bricks left from the chimney would be used on the front of the building for repair. Mrs. Spitler stated that three professionals had looked at the

### RESTORATION AND ARCHITECTURAL BOARD OF REVIEW

## October 23, 2007

issues and made recommendations. Water damage behind the brick was unknown at this time.

Mrs. Spitler stated that currently funds were being solicited to fund the repair. The necessary funds should be in hand prior to the work being performed in the spring.

Board Members found the following: The structure use to be a post office and had large windows, those windows were filled in with brick (that didn't match); The fireplace brick did not go to the foundation and it was assumed that it was used for a stove; A water repellant would not be used; The exact date of the structure was unknown; The practicality of the chimney was called into question; The chimney was not part of the prominence of the building;

Mrs. Wert stated that it was her opinion that the chimney added little to nothing to the architectural suitability to the exterior of the structure. The chimney was not a major architectural feature. If the chimney was in the front or the side of the building and went all the way to the ground or extended away from the building or had stucco on it, then it would be significant to the architecture. The chimney was obviously utilitarian chimney and was no longer in use and to remove it did nothing to damage the design of the building.

Board Members inquired about available grant monies. Mr. Spring reviewed the Certified Local Government regulations and stipulations. Also reviewed was the difference between the National Historical Society Registrar and Tipp City Historical District.

Chairman Himes asked for further discussion. There being none Mr. Blake **moved to** approve the application as submitted to include the removal of the chimney, seconded by Mrs. Wert. **Motion carried.** Ayes: Blake, Wert, Gaster, Kidwell, and Himes. Nays: Bagi.

**B.** Carol Shepherd for Third Street Salon - 16 S. Third Street, Tipp City - Lot: Inlot 37 - The applicant requested Restoration Board approval for the replacement of a projection sign for the business located at 16 S. Third Street.

**Present zoning district:** CC/RA- Community Center/Old Tippecanoe City Restoration and Historic District

**Section(s):** §154.052(I)(9)

Mr. Spring stated that resulting from a change in ownership; the applicant was seeking an approved Certificate of Appropriateness from the Restoration Board regarding the placement of a projecting sign for the business located at 16 S. Third Street. The proposed sign (Third Street Salon) would replace the existing sign (Kelly & Dee's Hair & Gifts). The proposed sign was +/- 3.33 sq. ft. in total area, and was +/- 20" wide and +/- 24" tall. The double sided sign would have white and gold lettering over a black

#### RESTORATION AND ARCHITECTURAL BOARD OF REVIEW

## October 23, 2007

background. The sign would include a maroon border. The proposed sign would replace (utilize existing bracket) an existing *Kelly & Dee's* sign previously approved by the Restoration Board on September 12, 1990.

Staff noted that per Section §154.100, the sign in question was within the parameters of the total allowable area for wall/projecting signage for general commerce in a non-residential zoning district.

Section 154.052(I)(9) indicates that the Restoration & Architectural Board Of Review shall review plans for signs.

Mr. Spring provided information regarding signage, per the Guidelines Booklet, to the Board Members in their staff reports for their review.

Mr. Spring also stated that if the Restoration Board approved the applicant's request, a Certificate of Appropriateness would be issued in accordance with code. A sign permit had been applied for by the applicant and would be issued administratively upon approval of the Certificate of Appropriateness and payment of the corresponding permit fee.

Mrs. Shepherd stated that the building would be used as a beauty salon.

Chairman Himes asked for further discussion. There being none Mrs. Wert **moved to approve the application to include the sign that used the existing brackets,** seconded by Mr. Bagi. **Motion carried.** Ayes: Wert, Bagi, Blake, Gaster, Kidwell, and Himes. Nays: None.

# Old Business

There was none.

### Miscellaneous

# A. Certified Local Government Application Update

Mr. Spring reviewed a letter written to Mrs. Judy Krasniewski, Grants Manager with the Ohio Historic Preservation Office. The correspondance noted the basic synopsis of the grant that the city had applied for the fiscal year of 2008. Tipp city was seeking grant assistance for Multiple Property Documentation (MPD) National Register Nomination for historic industrial properties within the "Legacy District" of Tipp City.

Tipp City's historic preservation goals and objectives were documented in the Tipp City Historic Preservation Plan, which was adopted by City Council in March, 2007. Tipp city's historic preservation goals and objectives were focused on capitalizing on past successes and addressing current challenges. One specific recommendation of the plan was the MPD/National Register Nomination.

#### RESTORATION AND ARCHITECTURAL BOARD OF REVIEW

## October 23, 2007

Board Members inquired if Staff had other projects identified for future. Mr. Spring stated that there were several possibilities and Staff continues to move forward with recommendations of the Historic Preservation Plan.

# B. Historic District Photo Update

Mr. Spring stated that he appreciated everyone's participation. Currently there were approximately three hundred and fifty photos in one database. Mr. Spring will be burning cd's for all Members.

Chairman Himes had inquired if Mr. Hoover was to paint the brick on the west side of the structure, which would be the new Coldwater Café. Board Members agreed that it would be inappropriate to paint the brick but the actual Certificate of Appropriateness did not note the painting of the brick. Mr. Spring stated that he would contact Mr. Hoover to confirm.

Mr. Blake mentioned that the City Manager, David Collinsworth, was leaving and stated that Mr. Collinsworth had been a huge proponent of downtown Tipp City and the Historic District. When Mr. Blake served on City Council, Mr. Collinsworth lit the spark which started the preservation plan concept. Mr. Blake stated that Mr. Collinsworth was a huge talent and that the City would not hick-up at all with his departure due to our incredible staff. Mr. Blake stated that he would be greatly missed.

Chairman Himes remarked about how favorably he was impressed with the way Tipp City operates and that other managers had commented that Mr. Collinsworth was a "hot property".

### Adjournment

Chairman Himes asked for further discussion or comments. There being none, Mr. Kidwell, **moved for adjournment**, seconded by Mr. Bagi and unanimously approved. Meeting adjourned at 8:26 p.m.

ATTEST:	APPROVED:
Mrs. Kimberly Patterson - Board Secretary	Chairman Robert Himes